

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-53 are currently pending in the above-captioned application. Applicants, however, respectfully point out that additional claims, 54-61, were added in a preliminary amendment dated December 8, 2005. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner enter claims 54-61 into the record as well. Accordingly, claims 1-61 are currently pending in the above-referenced application.

The Examiner issued a restriction requirement in the Office Action in which it is urged that there are three separate inventions.

Applicants elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I of claims 1-41 drawn to a species where the polymer is formed for acrylic acid monomers. However, as part of their traverse response, Applicants submit revised claims in which Claim 1 has been amended (*see above claim amendment and below*).

In the event that, the restriction requirement is maintained, even for the currently amended claims, Applicants confirm that they are prepared to cancel the alleged separate inventions of Groups II and III, i.e. claims 42-45 and 46-53. In such circumstances, Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application on the non-elected claims at a later time.

Traverse

Claim 1 has been amended to include that the coating passivates the reactive surface of the tungsten particle cores. Applicants respectfully submit that there is clear support for claim amendment 1. Specifically, claim support can be found on page 4, lines 8-29 of the specification. Since clear basis has been shown on page 4, lines 8-29 of the specification as filed, it is believed that the amendment does not add new subject matter.

WO03/075961 mentions that “other materials could be considered for various reasons including cost, stability, or other factors” and that it is expected that coating other metal cores including e.g. tungsten, will provide tolerance results which are similar to the use of gold. Applicants have however found, see p. 2, line 34 to page 3, line 17 that the use of thioglucose used in WO03/075961 is not feasible for the passivation of more reactive particles such as those of tungsten. Furthermore, there is no basis in WO03/075961 for particles with a core having a tungsten content of 20 to 100 weight% of metallic tungsten and that a charged coating layer can be employed. Applicants therefore hold that the particles of claim 1 are novel over WO03/075961.

Additionally, Applicants hold that all claims as amended are inventive over WO03/075961. The authors of WO03/075961 did not recognize the problems with the pyrogenic properties of tungsten nanoparticles, and that this problem could be solved by coating the metallic core with a charged coating layer to passivate the reactive surface of the tungsten particle cores. Based on the state of art, including WO03/075961, the person

Appl. No. 10/560,065
Amdt. Dated: June 3, 2009
Reply to Office Action of April 3, 2009

skilled in the art would not realize that metallic tungsten particles could be stabilized and passivated by coating with a charged coating layer.

Since amended claim 1 is believed to possess a “special technical feature”, Applicants contend that Groups I, II, and III submitted herewith do possess unity, and that consequently the restriction requirement should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks hereinabove, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-61 should be examined together in the instant application.

Any questions with respect to the foregoing may be directed to Applicant's undersigned agent at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Craig Bohlken/
Craig Bohlken
Reg. No. 52,628

GE Healthcare, Inc.
101 Carnegie Center
Princeton, NJ 08540
Phone (609) 514-6530
I:\IP\Response to Restriction Requirements\PN\PN0374 (06-03-2009).doc